

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

27 October 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR: OC Executive Board Members

FROM : [REDACTED]  
Secretary, OC Executive Board

SUBJECT : Executive Board Agenda

A meeting of the OC Executive Board is scheduled for 2 November 1976 (Tuesday) at 1000 hours in the D/CO Conference Room (2A03 [REDACTED]) Agenda items for this meeting are listed below:

a. Centralized OC Planning? (Refer to Attachment A)

b. Comcenter Nomenclature and CATRAN  
(Refer to Attachment B)

c. Results of the Study on the Suggestion for Improving the Competitive Evaluation System  
(See Agenda Item #1 Minutes of the OC Executive Board - 7 September 1976. C/OC-S will provide information to the Board Members prior to the 2 November meeting.)



Attachments:

- A. 3 MFR's Re OC Planning
- B. Comcenter Nomenclature & CATRAN

Distribution:

- 1 - D/CO w/attns.
- 1 - DD/CO w/attns.
- 1 - C/OC-O w/attns.
- 1 - C/OC-E w/attns.
- 1 - C/OC-S w/attns.
- 1 - C/OC-P&B w/attns.
- 1 - C/OC-CS w/attns.
- 1 - C/OC-O [REDACTED] w/attns.

E2 IMPDET

CL BY [REDACTED]

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

CONFIDENTIAL

12 October 1976

Att. A

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: OC Planning

25X1 1. At the present time there is diffused responsibility for planning within OC. Each major element in the office has personnel performing planning functions and there are a number of planning committees, teams and groups. (Sixteen people in the [ ] are assigned to units with titles indicating a planning role.) The system results in confusion concerning roles, redundancy in work efforts, competition to have parochial ideas and projects accepted and various definitions of Agency, office and project objectives. It appears that projects often drive MBO objectives rather than being initiated in response to long range requirements. The distributed planning approach often acts as a roadblock to effective analysis of problems and effectiveness evaluation of programs. For instance, Staff Operations can determine the work load placed upon a field station by narrative traffic processing but it is difficult for them to factor in the covert work load to complete the picture. Engineering is presently working on a narrative network improvement plan while Operations is working separately to determine future requirements. OC-CS is working with NSA to acquire the KG-84 series of cryptographic equipment while Engineering is working on ways to more efficiently utilize existing cryptographic equipment (not to mention the possibility of using the 300 in-stock KG-13 units.) The secure voice plan was last updated in 1973 while we are having to make major decisions now to maintain an adequate level of service. The distributed planning approach produced adequate results in the past but may not be the best approach in the future. Systems are becoming increasingly complex. There is an increasing interrelationship between OC programs and those of other offices in the Agency and other agencies in the Government. A centralized plans staff is needed to coordinate the OC efforts and ensure that they are in accord with outside demands.

2. It would be opportune at this time to establish a Plans Branch which reports directly to the Director of Communications. The most logical place for such a branch

E2 IMPDET

CL BY: [ ]

25X1

CONFIDENTIAL

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

is the Program and Budget Staff, e.g., create a true PPB staff. This arrangement would tie planning, programming and budgeting together in one office which reports directly to the OC decision makers. The decision makers could then rely upon one group to accumulate information, develop plans, present alternatives, monitor progress, control funds and evaluate the results of expenditures. Centralized planning would provide direction for the various OC staffs. Their efforts would then be directed towards the accomplishment of clear, long-range office objectives. These staffs could then concentrate on resolving daily problems and managing short-term projects. Personnel now assigned to long-range planning duties would be available for other assignments or free to concentrate on shorter range planning efforts.

3. A Programs and Budget Staff Plans Branch should consist of three well-qualified people in the GS-13 to GS-15 grade range. This range would allow for coordination at the working level within OC and provide for impact when dealing with other offices within the Agency and with other agencies. The branch would not be able to function effectively without the status provided by an adequate grade structure or the power base provided by a relationship with the OC Executive Office. The three officers should possess a mix of skills. The ideal staff would be composed of a technically well grounded engineer or technician, an automation specialist and a widely experienced operations officer. Demonstrated ability to think in broad, rational terms, to organize effectively and to coordinate with various groups is perhaps more important than technical abilities or background. It is most important that the members of the staff have the confidence of the senior OC managers.

4. Some areas where a centralized plans staff might begin are listed below:

a. Carefully analyze the present OC objectives and programs to determine the features of the system which will result if they are continued. Determine what projects are related, what impact they have on each other and where they conflict, overlap, or compliment each other. Measure the benefits and cost of each program and determine if the programs are in accord with long-range OC goals.

b. Provide a focal point for OC planning. Coordinate staff and covert planning efforts. Be aware of planning activities throughout OC.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

c. Estimate future requirements for existing assets, i.e., HF relay stations. Determine the future role of overseas relay stations. Are overseas message switch systems required or will black patch facilities serve our future needs?

d. Develop broad objectives for the narrative network. Ensure that the plan will meet the needs of OC customers and that the network is flexible in nature so as to be adaptable to changing requirements. Can we afford to stay with a system that simulates torn tape relay?

e. Plan for the optimum use of resources: people, money and equipment. Optimally have outlines of contingency plans available to respond to demands for increased service or resource reductions.

f. Continuously evaluate the effectiveness of OC activities.

g. Determine future OC cryptographic needs. Can we use the KG-13 as the basic unit for the next five to ten years; should we rely upon NSA producing the KG-84 (what features should it contain); or should OC develop a narrative cryptographic system in-house?

h. Evaluate alternatives to the Morse network. What impact would the elimination of the Morse code requirement have on hiring practices for Panel T personnel?

i. Develop a broad plan to enable OC to meet projected secure voice requirements and to interface effectively with the systems being developed by other agencies.

j. Develop a comprehensive plan to meet non-official cover communication needs. How will this requirement impact on staff communication resources?

k. Develop a means to acquire information required for management decisions. Is there an efficient way to measure field station work loads?

l. Monitor programs such as E SVN and WWMCCS to anticipate impact on OC, to take advantage of opportunities and to distribute precise information for use by managers.

m. Determine what redistribution of resources will be required to meet the growing demands of directorates other than the DDO.

5. The ideas presented above are not all inclusive but hopefully will present the concept of a centralized planning staff adequately. A centralized staff would be effective only if it did not become involved directly in daily activities but did obtain frequent feedback concerning current activities and problems.



25X1

Distribution:

Original forwarded Thru C/OC-O/SOD. C/OC-O, to DD/CO

25X1

ORIG:OC-O/SOD/PB:



12 October 1976

CONFIDENTIAL

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

14 October 1976

The following comments are relative to the 12 October paper on ~~the~~ subject of OC planning written by [ ] and forwarded to the DD/CO.

25X1

1. I have been aware for some time of deficiencies in the OC planning process and have several times made efforts to correct this. These efforts include the initiation of a requirements determination and a resultant network improvement plan. Within SOD, the Plans Branch was a new and very limited (2 man) activity when I took over the Division and I have emphasized beefing up that activity, both in terms of number of personnel and the type of personnel. I believe we have made good progress in this regard. The above is primarily to note my past and continuing concern and efforts in the planning area.

2. A small (3 man) staff will not be able to do any substantive work on the broad range of activities which need to be addressed, as addressed by [ ] list of 13 areas, which list is acknowledged to be incomplete. Such a staff would probably be in a position of attempting to provide guidance to the other office elements and may result in a layering effect thereby diluting, rather than enhancing, the planning activity.

25X1

3. The establishment of such a staff may result in a drain on the planning assets of other activities, which are vital and in some cases just beginning to be effective.

4. The establishment of a staff under P&B may appear to remove it from the perceived parochial interests of operations or engineering but may, in fact, place it in another area of parochial interest - the budget. There may be a tendency to plan within existing or foreseen budgetary bounds rather than placing primary emphasis on the satisfaction of user requirements.

5. A separate staff would probably become out of touch with ongoing operations and other elements of the office in a short period of time and thereby be reduced in its effectiveness.

E2 IMPDET

CL BY: [ ]

25X1

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CONFIDENTIAL

6. Having taken pains to point out my concern for the need for improved planning in the office, I should note that the negative comments given above should not be viewed as roadblocks, but as real concerns. With greater and more effective attention being given to long-range planning by SOD, I believe that the present system and structure in the office is becoming more effective in this area and should probably be given an opportunity to work before making a change such as is contemplated. Additionally, planning activities which are already under way, such as the network improvement plan, should be pursued to completion rather than undertaking new similar efforts, however they might be organized. 25X1A



CONFIDENTIAL

**CONFIDENTIAL**

20 October 1976

## MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT : OC Planning

REFERENCE: Memoranda for the Record dated 12 and 14 October,  
Same Subject

1. After reviewing the references, and after giving much thought to the subject, I find myself in agreement with many of the points contained in both references.

2. There is no question that OC planning is fragmented and often takes diverse routes in the various components. Centralized planning is needed in OC which should be able to pull together the various thoughts and programs into one cohesive effort.

3. I do question, however, whether the centralized planning should occur in OC-P&B. Although it would work, I do not believe it would be the best place for it.  paper touches on some of the problems I have with this approach. Planning essentially is an operational task, with a great deal of engineering input and support. Having a third party, such as OC-P&B, also become involved in the staff work might create an unnecessary bureaucratic layer to the whole planning process. In the final analysis, the Chief of Operations should be responsible for planning, in my opinion.

25X1

4. If one accepts the premise that planning is an operational responsibility, then I believe it should be done in OC-O. Because the planning must include a great deal more on the covert side than in the past, I recommend that a plans division be established in OC-O which would work on both the staff and covert effort, with engineering involved in all aspects of the planning exercises. Thus, OC-O would have the control and authority I believe he should have regarding this very important subject.



25X1

E3 IMPDET  
CL BY 

25X1

**CONFIDENTIAL**



**Page Denied**

Next 6 Page(s) In Document Denied

OC-S M76-348  
- 1 NOV 1978

MEMORANDUM FOR: Office of Communications Executive Board  
FROM : Chief, Communications Services  
SUBJECT : Designation of GS-09 Personnel for Promotion

1. Several methods may be used to "designate" or "lock-in" Panel T GS-09 personnel for promotion to GS-10:

Method A - Designating a specific number of promotions annually; e.g., difference between carry-over and specific number.

Method B - Designating a specific minimum number of promotions annually, e.g., 20 designations regardless of carry-over.

Method C - Designating a specific minimum and maximum number of promotions annually, e.g., 20 designations regardless of carry-over up to a limit of 30 promotions.

2. The method chosen should be easily understood by the GS-09's; should provide protection against sawtoothing at some fixed level; and should protect against excessive mortgaging of headroom.

3. Referring to Attachment A, it can be seen that Method A does not meet the above criteria in several respects. First it does not guarantee a minimum specific number of designees annually but, rather, designates a number which

is the difference between the "lock-in" number and those carried-over from the previous year. And, because the number of new "lock-ins" will vary annually, it will not be easily understood. It does provide maximum protection against mortgaging headroom.

4. Method B and Method C are similar in that they both provide for a minimum number of new designees annually regardless of carry-over. Therefore, they would be easily understood and would provide fixed minimum protection against sawtoothing. The method is susceptible to an accumulation of mortgaged headroom if the minimum fixed number chosen is too large.

5. Method C differs from Method B in that a maximum specified number is also employed. The effect that this has is to limit the maximum amount in any one year. The excess headroom is distributed in the following year(s).

6. The number 20 was chosen for all three methods because it is approximately 5% of the GS-09 population, a figure we did not reach in CEL years 1972 and 1975. The four year average of 22 was deemed too high because it is not known whether or not we will ever again have a "good" year like we did in 1973.

7. Assuming that headroom in any one year may never again exceed 30, then Method B would be superior to Method C in that guaranteed minimums are the same but, because

there is no upper limit, it will not have a negative psychological effect. Conversely, if another 30 promotion-plus year is anticipated, or if one were to occur every four years or so, Method C would be more equitable. Method A is thought to be the least desirable method of the three for it does not guarantee a minimum number per year, for example, note that only 15 GS-09's would be designated for promotion in 1976.

8. Regardless of the Method adopted, it is suggested that the designees be promoted in order of date-of-grade rather than order-of-rank on the CCEL. This procedure will give credit for time-in-grade without disturbing the basic concept of competition among peers based on performance.

9. Attachment B is a proposed addendum to OCHB-F 20.20.1 describing the new procedure. The description used is that of Method B.

10. The Method chosen could be made effective almost immediately or, inasmuch as we are anticipating over 20 promotions this year (which exceeds the guaranteed minimum of 20 promotion designations), the new procedure could be deferred and studied against actual events for another year.

Attachments: As Stated



25X1A

ATTACHMENT A

PCEL YEAR	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976
ACTUAL PROMOTIONS	17	38	22	13	22*

## METHOD A

PCEL YEAR	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976
DESIGNATION	20	38	22	20	15
ACCUMULATION	3	0	0	7	0

## METHOD B

PCEL YEAR	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976
DESIGNATED	20	38	22	20	20
ACCUMULATION	3	0	0	7	5

## METHOD C

PCEL YEAR	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976
DESIGNATED	20	30	30	20	20
ACCUMULATION	3	0	0	7	5

\*PROJECTED 1976 PROMOTIONS

1. To more equitably reward Panel T GS-09 personnel who rank high on the Consolidated Competitive Evaluation List (CCEL), we will designate annually a specific minimum number of GS-09's for promotion regardless of the actual promotional headroom available.

2. The minimum number designated for promotion will be 20, or approximately 5% of the present GS-09 population in Panel T. This means that if you rank in the top 20 positions on the CCEL, you will be promoted...if not that particular year, then the next or when headroom becomes available.

3. If you are designated for promotion but are not actually promoted during that CEL year, the following year you will be rated in accordance with BYCELS but not ranked, and you will be promoted unless there is a specific recommendation against promotion.

4. Although there is a guaranteed minimum number of designations for promotion, there is no maximum. Therefore, for example, if headroom is available for 30 promotions, then 30 will be made.

5. Once the "designated for promotion" list has been established, personnel so designated will be notified. Promotional headroom will then be allocated (and promotions made) from among the designated list but in order of seniority (time-in-grade) and not by order-of-rank.

ATTACHMENT

6. In the event the number selected proves to be either too high or too low (the higher the number the more protection against sawtoothing but the more the likelihood of excessive carry-over from one year to the next), it will be changed based on observed promotion rates, and the change will be published prior to the next complete Panel T GS-09 competitive evaluation cycle.

20 October 1976

25X1 MEMORANDUM FOR: [REDACTED]

25X1 FROM : [REDACTED]

Bill,

The subject of planning and how we do it in the Office of Communications has been the subject of a number of informal chats within the components. In the sense of a comprehensive overall plan, I believe that Ops and Engineering have been the components mostly concerned. On one of my peripatetic tours into Staff Ops, I got involved in such a spontaneous discussion with [REDACTED] I asked Jim to put together his thoughts on the need, as he perceived it, for a centralized planning staff. That paper is attached. As you can see, it has also collected its own attachments representing other perceptions.

25X1

I think our senior officer level agrees that we need to put a greater stress on planning, planning in the sense of validating today's decision in the light of tomorrow's situation, and not planning as forecasting. There is little disagreement that presently our planning is diffused, redundant, and occasionally at cross-purposes. The three opinions from Messrs. [REDACTED] all provide some insight from the perceptions of the individuals involved. The suggestion of Jim that we put the plans staff into Ops as the single planning staff is one of which I disagree. Firstly, I disagree for the pragmatic reason that to put it in Ops would cause our Chief, Engineering considerable heartburn. This might well result in institutional tensions which would get in the way of our efforts to be productive. Secondly, and of greater importance, planning is a function of command and can only go forward when the individual ultimately responsible for the success of the organization gives the planning element clear precise instructions. I know of no instance where a planning function has worked successfully when assigned below the command level in a subordinate component competing with the organizational components. Planning is effective

25X1



25X1 only as it reflects command <sup>and</sup> as it has frequent two way access to command to keep the planning mechanism finely tuned. The arguments advanced by [ ] that putting planning in P&B might create a bureaucratic layer are traditional arguments based upon the assumption that a planning staff is involved in plans in the PPB sense. In actual fact, having a number of subordinate planning units is an even greater bureaucratic layer.

The argument that putting plans with P&B might cause the parochial budget aspects to impede planning may be a more cogent argument. If so, I guess my response to that would be to recommend the establishment of a separate plans staff reporting directly to you.

25X1 [ ] argument that a separate staff might get out of touch with ongoing operations can be obviated by firm direction to that staff. All of the above and the attached is merely to advise you that there is considerable concern about how we plan and how we should plan. The alternatives would appear to be:

- a. No change because the planning mechanisms, although competing, are effective enough;
- b. Consolidate planning in Ops;
- c. Consolidate planning in Engineering;
- d. Consolidate planning in P&B;
- e. Establish a separate planning staff reporting to the D/CO;
- f. None of the above.

Do you have a preference

25X1